1	BINGHAM McCUTCHEN LLP DONN P. PICKETT (SBN 72257)	Robert A. Mittelstaedt (SBN 060359) Jason McDonell (SBN 115084)
2	GEOFFREY M. HOWARD (SBN 157468)	Elaine Wallace (SBN 197882)
2	HOLLY A. HOUSE (SBN 136045)	JONES DAY
3	ZACHARY J. ALINDER (SBN 209009) BREE HANN (SBN 215695)	555 California Street, 26 <sup>th</sup> Floor San Francisco, CA 94104
4	Three Embarcadero Center	Telephone: (415) 626-3939
	San Francisco, CA 94111-4067	Facsimile: (415) 875-5700
5	Telephone: (415) 393-2000 Facsimile: (415) 393-2286	ramittelstaedt@jonesday.com
6	donn.pickett@bingham.com	jmcdonell@jonesday.com ewallace@jonesday.com
	geoff.howard@bingham.com	•
7	holly.house@bingham.com	Tharan Gregory Lanier (SBN 138784)
8	zachary.alinder@bingham.com bree.hann@bingham.com	Jane L. Froyd (SBN 220776) JONES DAY
	BOIES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP	1755 Embarcadero Road
9	DAVID BOIES (Admitted <i>Pro Hac Vice</i> )	Palo Alto, CA 94303
10	333 Main Street	Telephone: (650) 739-3939 Facsimile: (650) 739-3900
10	Armonk, NY 10504	tglanier@jonesday.com
11	Telephone: (914) 749-8200 Facsimile: (914) 749-8300	jfroyd@jonesday.com
10	dboies@bsfllp.com	
12	STEVEN C. HOLTZMAN (SBN 144177)	Scott W. Cowan (Admitted <i>Pro Hac Vice</i> ) Joshua L. Fuchs (Admitted <i>Pro Hac Vice</i> )
13	1999 Harrison St., Suite 900	JONES DAY
	Oakland, CA 94612 Telephone: (510) 874-1000	717 Texas, Suite 3300
14	Facsimile: (510) 874-1460	Houston, TX 77002 Telephone: (832) 239-3939
15	sholtzman@bsfllp.com	Facsimile: (832) 239-3600
	fnorton@bsfllp.com	swcowan@jonesday.com
16	DORIAN DALEY (SBN 129049) JENNIFER GLOSS (SBN 154227)	jlfuchs@jonesday.com
17	500 Oracle Parkway, M/S 5op7	Attorneys for Defendants
	Redwood City, CA 94070	SAP AG, SAP AMERICA, INC., and
18	Telephone: (650) 506-4846 Facsimile: (650) 506-7114	TOMORROWNOW, INC.
19	dorian.daley@oracle.com	
	jennifer.gloss@oracle.com	
20	Attorneys for Plaintiffs	
21	Oracle USA, Inc., et al.	
		ES DISTRICT COURT
22		RICT OF CALIFORNIA
23		ND DIVISION
23	ORACLE USA, INC., et al.,	Case No. 07-CV-1658 PJH (EDL)
24	Plaintiffs,	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]
25	,	ORDER TO EXTEND TEMPORARY
23	v.	STAY OF EXECUTION OF
26	SAP AG, et al.,	JUDGMENT AND STIPULATED REQUEST TO EXTEND BRIEFING
27	, , ,	SCHEDULE
41	Defendants.	
28		

# 

#### **Stipulation to Extend Temporary Stay of Execution of Judgment**

WHEREAS, the Court entered final judgment in the above-captioned matter on February 3, 2011 (ECF No. 1036);

WHEREAS, Rule 62(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provides that "no execution may issue on a judgment, nor may proceedings be taken to enforce it, until 14 days have passed after its entry," Fed. R. Civ. P. 62(a);

WHEREAS, at the Parties' request, the Court granted a temporary stay of execution of final judgment, which will expire on March 10, 2011;

WHEREAS, the Parties continue to negotiate an appropriate security for the judgment;

WHEREAS, the Parties agree to: (i) extend the temporary stay of execution for an additional 14 days, and (ii) should Defendants file a motion pursuant to Rules 62(b) and 62(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to stay of execution of final judgment pending disposition of post-judgment motions and, if necessary, an appeal by having the Court set an appropriate security ("Rule 62(b) and 62(d) Motion") within that 14-day time period, extend the temporary stay of execution through the Court's ruling on the Rule 62(b) and 62(d) Motion;

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED by the Parties, through their respective counsel of record, that execution of judgment shall be stayed until March 24, 2011, or, should Defendants file a Rule 62(b) and 62(d) Motion on or before March 24, 2011, that execution of judgment shall be stayed through the Court's ruling on the Rule 62(b) and 62(d) Motion.

### **Stipulated Request to Extend Briefing Schedule**

Pursuant to Civil Local Rules 6-2, 6-12, and 7-4, the Parties submit this stipulated request to extend the briefing schedule for post-judgment briefs filed pursuant to Rule 50(b) and Rule 59 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (the "Post-Trial Motions").

Following the filing of the Parties' February 18, 2011 Stipulated Request, Dkt. No. 1041, the Court set a briefing and hearing schedule for the Post-Trial Motions in the Court's February 23, 2011 Order, Dkt. No. 1043. Given the complexity of the issues addressed in the Post-Trial Motions, good cause exists for a minor extension of the time to file Opposition and Reply Briefs.

### Case4:07-cv-01658-PJH Document1050 Filed03/10/11 Page3 of 4

1	Specifically, the Parties jointly request that the Court grant an additional 9-day extension to file		
2	Opposition Briefs and an additional 5-day extension to file Reply Briefs. As the current hearing		
3	date set by the Court is July 13, 2011, the Parties do not believe that the requested additional		
4	extension of time, which still provides the Court approximately 2.5 months to consider the		
5	Parties' briefing, will impact the hearing date or the Court's consideration of the Post-Trial		
6	Motions.		
7	Accordingly, the Parties request that the Court modify the briefing schedule as follows:		
8	April 8 Deadline to file Opposition Briefs		
9	April 27 Deadline to file Reply Briefs		
10	July 13 Hearing		
11	The only purpose of this request is to extend the briefing deadlines as noted above, and		
12	thus, this request neither affects any other rights or obligations of the Parties, nor impacts the		
13	briefing page limits or briefing description set forth in the Parties' February 18, 2011 Stipulated		
14	Request, Dkt. No. 1041, and approved by the Court's February 23, 2011 Order, Dkt. No. 1043.		
15			
15 16	IT IS SO STIPULATED.		
	IT IS SO STIPULATED.  Dated: March 9, 2011 Bingham McCutchen LLP		
16			
16 17	Dated: March 9, 2011 Bingham McCutchen LLP		
16 17 18	Dated: March 9, 2011  Bingham McCutchen LLP  By: /s/ Geoffrey M. Howard  Geoffrey M. Howard		
16 17 18 19	Dated: March 9, 2011  Bingham McCutchen LLP  By: /s/ Geoffrey M. Howard  Geoffrey M. Howard  Attorneys for Plaintiffs Oracle USA, Inc., Oracle International		
16 17 18 19 20	Dated: March 9, 2011  Bingham McCutchen LLP  By: /s/ Geoffrey M. Howard Geoffrey M. Howard Attorneys for Plaintiffs		
16 17 18 19 20 21	Dated: March 9, 2011  Bingham McCutchen LLP  By: /s/ Geoffrey M. Howard  Geoffrey M. Howard  Attorneys for Plaintiffs Oracle USA, Inc., Oracle International		
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Dated: March 9, 2011  Bingham McCutchen LLP  By: /s/ Geoffrey M. Howard  Geoffrey M. Howard  Attorneys for Plaintiffs  Oracle USA, Inc., Oracle International Corporation, and Siebel Systems, Inc.		
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Dated: March 9, 2011  Bingham McCutchen LLP  By: /s/ Geoffrey M. Howard Geoffrey M. Howard Attorneys for Plaintiffs Oracle USA, Inc., Oracle International Corporation, and Siebel Systems, Inc.  In accordance with General Order No. 45, Rule X, the above signatory attests that		
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Dated: March 9, 2011  Bingham McCutchen LLP  By: /s/ Geoffrey M. Howard Geoffrey M. Howard Attorneys for Plaintiffs Oracle USA, Inc., Oracle International Corporation, and Siebel Systems, Inc.  In accordance with General Order No. 45, Rule X, the above signatory attests that		
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Dated: March 9, 2011  Bingham McCutchen LLP  By: /s/ Geoffrey M. Howard Geoffrey M. Howard Attorneys for Plaintiffs Oracle USA, Inc., Oracle International Corporation, and Siebel Systems, Inc.  In accordance with General Order No. 45, Rule X, the above signatory attests that		

## Case4:07-cv-01658-PJH Document1050 Filed03/10/11 Page4 of 4 Dated: March 9, 2011 JONES DAY By: /s/ Tharan Gregory Lanier Tharan Gregory Lanier Counsel for Defendants SAP AG, SAP AMERICA, INC., and TOMORROWNOW, INC. PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED: 3/10/11 By: Hon. Judge Phyllis J. Hamilton United